REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the Office Action. This paper is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection and objection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Applicant asserts that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1 - 33 are pending in the application. Claims 1 – 33 have been rejected. Claims 2, 4, 6 and 9 have been voluntarily amended for clarification and correction of some typographical errors. These amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims nor are they being made for reasons of patentability. New claim 34 has been added in order to further define what the Applicants consider to be the invention. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 - 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable by Hull et al. (US Patent 5,192,559) in view of Newell et al. (US 2004/0183226)

Applicants respectfully submit that US S/N 10/815,510 ('510), published as US 2004/0183226 to Newell et al. is not a proper prior art reference for the subject patent application as its priority date is later than the priority date of the subject application. The '510 application, as appearing on the face of the publication and in the United States and Trademark website, is a continuation of application No. 09/970,727, filed on October 3, 2001. The subject application, S/N 10/724,399, is a continuation of application of No. 09/412,618, filed on October 6, 1999. Accordingly, the '510 application is not a proper prior art reference and the rejections of claim 1 - 33 should be withdrawn.

Best Available Copy

Furthermore, In the Office Action, the Examiner contended that "it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Hull with the teaching of Newell in order to provide successfully separate supports from a three-dimensional object without undesirably affecting the underlying three-dimensional object".

Hull has been discussed in the response to the previous Office Action, filed on August 22, 2005. Based on the response, the Examiner has withdrawn the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections, which were based on Hull. It should be emphasized that Hull is directed to stereolithography. Even if Newell was a proper prior art reference, the combination of Hull and Newell (or another prior art reference directed to selective deposition modeling) is inappropriate for the following reasons.

The two methods of 3-dimensional object manufacturing are different from each other and are based on different principles of operation. Hull describes the use of a polymer sheets with two layers (one on top of the other) to control the print-through problem which may occur during the process of selective curing of each layer. The selective curing cures the bulk material, such as the polymer sheet at desired positions and the remaining uncured material is removed. Accordingly support layers are not used with stereolithography.

The problem of print-through is obviously not relevant to the process of selective deposition in which the material is selectively deposited at discrete positions layer by layer. Accordingly, modifying the teaching of Hull with the teaching of a reference directed to selective deposition modeling would not teach or suggest any of claims 1 – 33 and also would render the reference inoperable for its intended purpose.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1 - 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10, 18 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hull et al. (US Patent 5,192,559) in view of Newell et al. (US 2004/0183226) as applied to claims 8, 17 and 26 and further in view of Penn et al. (U.S. Patent 5,594,652).

Best Available Copy

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Newell is not a proper prior art as discussed above. Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination of Hull and Penn, Applicants assert that neither Hull nor Penn, alone or in combination, teach or suggest either of claims 10, 18 and 27.

Claim 10 depends directly from claim 8; claim 18 depends directly from claim 17; and claim 27 depends directly from claim 26. Therefore, claims 10, 18 and 27 include distinct features of claims 8, 17 and 26, respectively. Claims 8, 17 and 26 are patentable over Hull as discussed above. Penn does not cure the deficiency of Hull. Therefore, claims 8, 17 and 26 are patentable over prior art references of Hull and Penn, alone or in combination. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10, 18 and 27 are patentable for at least the same reason as claims 8, 17, and 26.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 10, 18 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIM

Claim 34 has been added. As required by 37 CFR 1.111(c), the following remarks clearly point out the patentable novelty which Applicant thinks the newly added claim presents in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited.

Claim 34 depends indirectly from claim 1. Therefore, claim 34 includes distinct features of claim 1. Claim 1 is patentable over Hull as discussed above. Therefore, claim 34 is patentable over Hull. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 34 is patentable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of above remarks, the pending claims 1 - 34 are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any question or comment with regard to this paper, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Best Available Cop

Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

No fees are believed to be due in connection with this paper. However, if any such fees are due, please change such fees to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,

Guy Yonay
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 52,388

Dated: February 6, 2005

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
10 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 1001
New York, New York 10020
Tel: (212) 632-3480
Fax: (212) 632-3489

Best Available Copy